

THE OBJECTION TO ANTICIPATION

The unit in the previous art by Bessa (Bessa et al.: US Pub. NO.: 2003/0,096,642) is a container or holster that houses a cell phone unit. It clearly states in paragraph 11, that the device to be charge is a " battery powered portable device." The difference is that it does not incorporate the solar charging unit directly on the cell phone or the battery attached to the cell phone. In the latter, the solar charger and the communication device is one unit instead of a separation of two different units, a holster and a cell phone. The examiner's idea of anticipation by the prior art does not address the novelty of portability by consolidating both units into one. In paragraph 2 of the prior art it clearly states, " a holster for storing an electronic device having a rechargeable battery" and separately in the same paragraph it states about the holster, " to receive and store a cellular phone"

The idea of the cellular phone's ability to recharge itself without an outside unit is not addressed. This is one of the novelties of my invention as in the specification it clearly states, " this patent is used to address the tedious need of users to have to connect their phones to an alternate energy source." In this case the tedious use comes in the form of having to carry a separate unit that is detachable from the cell phone. The indirect and direct method in patent 10/04774 reduces the units to one by the placement of the photovoltaic cells on the surface of the phone or on the battery itself. For clarification of this my suggestion is altering the claims to illustrate the specifications claims along with the drawings as above. The issue was not addressed due to the publication date of the prior art patent.

A cell phone unit that has incorporated a charging system, and a photovoltaic panel on its surface that can obtain voltage or current source:

- a) directly through the panels on its surface.
- b) or b, indirectly through the battery attached to it.

In the previous art, it clearly states in paragraph 11 that the cell phone is a, "battery powered device." It does not incorporate the solar panels along the surface of the phone but puts it on a detachable separate unit, the holster. My idea isn't a holster that can provide solar power but the phone itself acting as its own charger by the placement of the photovoltaic cells along the surface either on the phone or on the battery without any additional attachable devices or accessories.

On the previous art, charge from the solar unit transfers to the phone from the bottom interface from units 105 and 405 so that the charging unit can be considered detachable or an accessory to the phone instead of apart of the phone. The charging system proposed in my idea needs no connection to the bottom interface from the external surface but is inherent within the system as a whole, creating 1 unit. This is done by the placement of the photovoltaic cells upon the surface of the cell phone or on the surface of the battery attached to the cell phone. This has the affect of reducing parts needed for solar charging. Parts no longer need as illustrated in the prior art are 300, 103, 104, 206 501, 502, 205 105, 204, 203 and 201. By simplifying the idea to 2 units only, 208 and 101 and integrating the charger unit within 101 through replacement of the photovoltaic cells this makes obsolete the units 105 and 405. This ultimately forgoes the need for a separate device, in this case a holster.

Charging transfer in the prior art is from units 405, and 105 to the

bottom of 101 whereas an incorporation of the charging unit in the phone to make 1 unit is the idea proposed in patent 10/04774. Transfer needs no connection or separate unit as the charging system is built in the phone itself. This is accomplished by the movement of the photovoltaic cells from the separate unit, the holster, unto the cell phone itself or the battery attached to the cell phone in the indirect method. This addresses the need for convenience and simplicity to the user of the device as there is not 1 unit instead of 2. This also allows the users to charge their phones with little or no hassle or having to deal with a cumbersome unit. Charging is done naturally and with ease allowing little to no attention by the user. It effectively eradicates the holster or any other separate unit as a need for charging. This is similar to the way solar power calculators operate. There is no need for a separate holster or device. The panels and charging system are inherent to the unit as a whole and connections are housed internally instead of externally.

My proposition is to change the claims as shown to further specify the differences by incorporating the placement of the photovoltaic cells in the claim and specifying the unit as one as mentioned previously. The prior art does show feasibility however does not address unity and simplicity thereby enhancing convenience. If there are any further addendums or suggestions that would improve the uniqueness of the patent against anticipation feel free to add comments or reply.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT

Another example of novelty against the anticipation of the prior art is the direct and indirect method. No cell phones or communication units have been specified as supplying voltage directly. Previous methods allow for voltage transfer indirectly through the battery from an accessory. The idea proposed in patent 10/047773 allows for the direct transfer of current from a solar panel to the phone without the need for a battery. In other words, the phone will be able to function without a battery pending the voltage from the panels is sufficient. Or it can be made to function with the battery. This direct method addresses the need for charging a cell phone without the use of a battery. It is the first patent to address this and is not anticipated. All other previous means and prior art has a connection to the battery through an accessory. By eliminating accessories and attachments along with the need for a battery elevates the invention described in the posed patent in a novelty arena of its own.

CONDITIONAL REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTIVE ASSISTANCE.

Applicant have amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. 2173.02 and 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.